

the livraison confined to the Scutellidæ? certainly it is, and Prof. Alex. Agassiz most explicitly says so; but what does the "so-called" Introduction deal with? In the space of 20 pages reference is made to (not to quote all) Forbes's 'British Starfishes' (itself a general work on Echinoderms), the classifications proposed by Müller and Troschel and by J. E. Gray for the Asterida, to M. Desmoulins's Studies on the Echinida, to Brandt's establishment of certain genera of *regular* Echini, to the same writer's classification of the Holothurians, to Grube's anatomy of *Sipunculus*, to Sars's researches into the development of *Asterias*, to J. Müller's labours on *Pentacrinus*, as well as to various memoirs on fossil forms.

(4) The genus *Tripneustes* is not defined in the essay referred to, but the type only mentioned as *E. ventricosus*.

(5) In the Introduction to Valentin's anatomy of *Echinus* the genus is well defined (p. viii).

(6) Notwithstanding certain cases to the contrary, I prefer to believe that, in the case of *Tripneustes* at any rate, L. Agassiz justly referred in the 'Nomenclator' to the paper in which he *amply defined* and so, strictly speaking, published that generic name.

There are two other statements of mine which it is not just to denounce as misrepresentations, for they both arise from my fundamental proposition that, in zoological nomenclature, names which antedate Linnæus do not exist; thus *variegata* gets put out of court, and 1788, not 1734, is, with me, the date of *unicolor*.

April 6, 1880.

Prof. W. H. Flower, LL.D., F.R.S., President, in the Chair.

The Secretary read the following extracts from two letters of Mr. Arthur E. Brown, Superintendent of the Gardens of the Zoological Society of Philadelphia, U.S.A., relating to the birth of an Elephant, which had taken place on the 10th ult. in Cooper and Bailey's menagerie at Philadelphia. These letters had been addressed to Mr. W. A. Conklin, C.M.Z.S., of New York, and had been kindly communicated to the Secretary by that gentleman.

"The baby Elephant was born only on Wednesday morning; is a female, strong and healthy, and I see no reason why they should not successfully rear it. They have another female which they say is eight months gone with young; and from examination I am inclined to think this is the case.

"Our Prosecutor, Dr. Chapman, was fortunate enough to obtain the placenta in perfect condition; the only other one known, I believe, is an imperfect specimen in the Royal College of Surgeons, London, sent in spirit from India. It is a good thing that this one has fallen into perfectly competent hands. The baby is a lively, interesting little thing, about two feet high, weight 213 pounds (an hour after birth), and is well worth seeing.

"I send you with pleasure some measurements of the baby Elephant. The height and weight were taken an hour after birth, the others three days later. I have doubts of the accuracy of the weight, as it does not seem to me possible that it can weigh so much. There are several other measurements I wanted; but the young one was very uneasy, and the mother did not like the operation; so it was by no means an easy task to get any.

Weight	213 lb.
Height at shoulder	34½ inches
Length of forearm and manus	16 "
" hind limb	30 "
" lower leg and pes	16½ "
Girth at thorax	45 "
" abdomen	49 "
" fore foot.	17 "
Length of trunk	12 "
Girth at base of trunk	9 "
Length of tail	20 "
Width between eyes	8½ "
Distance between articulations of jaw, across ..	26 "

"The young one was up and walking about very shortly after birth, has teeth in both jaws, and sucks with the mouth. The mamma of the mother when distended projects somewhat laterally; so that the trunk of the young one is thrown up, and rests, while sucking, in the angle between the shoulder and thorax.

"Father and mother are each about twenty-three or twenty-four years old, and about the same size, some eight feet high, I should say.

"The proportions of the young one, to the eye, are nearly those of the adult; it is somewhat darker in colour; and the hairs are rather more plentiful about the forehead and shoulders. The mother shows much attachment for it.

"They have another female, which is undoubtedly with young by the same male—a further support of the theory that the reproductive faculties of the male, under domestication, are affected to a greater extent, or more commonly, than those of the female.

"The period of gestation in this case was just 629 days, from June 20, 1878, to March 10, 1880; she took the male some five or six times during several days.

"I see no reason now to doubt that they will successfully rear it. The show will be here for a month yet; and I shall watch the young Elephant with much interest."

The following papers were read:—